



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the production of wealth (p. 52)? Similarly we find signs of that tendency always present in tariff discussions greatly to exaggerate the influence of the tariff, as when the high duty on iron and lumber is alone held responsible for the decline of shipbuilding (p. 62). Again it may be noted that exactly the same line of reasoning used to condemn the tariff because of the conditions in Rhode Island for which it is impliedly held responsible (pp. 336-349) could be used with equal justice if applied to England to prove the damning effects of free trade. Whether the cause of a scientific tariff will be promoted by reasoning of this character is seriously open to question.

But in the case of a book of this type, intended to arouse the public to realization of a serious evil, one is not justified in pushing such criticism further. Laborious attempts at accuracy of detail soon weary the general reader and carefully modified statements blunt his enthusiasm for reform. Especially may such criticism be disregarded since the line of attack on moral grounds here chosen will appeal most quickly to the public ear and, in the present state of sensitiveness on problems of this sort, will most readily secure the desired reaction. For these reasons it is to be hoped that this narrative of the much-neglected ethics of tariff legislation will have the widest circulation.

CHESTER W. WRIGHT.

Twenty-Seventh Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology to the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, 1905-1906. The Omaha Tribe. By ALICE C. FLETCHER and FRANCIS LA FLESCHÉ. (Washington: Government Printing Office. 1911. Pp. 672.)

OF all the Indian tribes whose industries, religious rites, or social institutions have been investigated and reported upon by the Bureau of Ethnology, none, perhaps, has received fuller and abler treatment than the Omaha. In the third annual report appeared Dorsey's *Omaha Sociology*, a pioneer effort of great merit, and now in the twenty-seventh comes Fletcher and La Flesché's *Omaha Tribe*, which is virtually an elaboration of, and a supplement to, the earlier work. The value of this book, as of its predecessor, is almost exclusively ethnological, for the history it contains is so meagre and so scattered as to be almost unrecognizable. In one instance, however, history or what pretends to be history, has been fairly dragged in and for no other purpose, apparently, than to enhance the tribal importance of the La Flesché family; this would have been somewhat excusable under the circumstances, had facts been strictly adhered to and the whole story told.

We refer to the biography of Joseph La Flesché, who was a half-breed Ponca, the adopted son of Big Elk the Second, head chief of the Omahas. Our authors, not on their own authority, but on the authority of a single Indian, Wa-je-pa, calmly assert Joseph La Flesché

to have been an Omaha, which is somewhat surprising, considering that, at the time of his attempted usurpation of the Omaha chieftainship, he was opposed on the ground that he was a Ponca, and considering that Rev. J. Owen Dorsey, who knew him intimately, called him unreservedly a Ponca and met with no denial from Joseph La Flesche himself who was then yet alive. Our authors, moreover, permit the reader to get the impression that Joseph La Flesche was the legitimate successor of Big Elk and innocently fail to record his deposition in 1865, although they admit that his installation was incomplete. Undoubtedly Joseph La Flesche, strong-willed, arrogant, and progressive, was largely responsible for the tribal dissensions that compelled the United States government to recognize "paper chiefs", and for the political disintegration that found its climax in the abolition of the ancient chieftainship in 1880.

Fletcher and La Flesche, like Dorsey but not so clearly or so positively as he, attempt to trace the migratory movements of the Omahas, who, in the company of their close cognates of the Siouan group—the Quapaws, Kansas, Osages, and Poncas—journeyed, at some indeterminate time, westward towards the Mississippi—an undivided band. At the mouth of the Ohio came the first tribal parting; for the Quapaws broke away and went down the stream, hence their name, while the others continued their course north and west. The next to break away were the Kansas and Osages and the last, the Poncas "on or near the Missouri River". The Omahas had by that time come into contact with the Arikara, of whose territory—Nebraska—they took possession. There they are to-day, exceptional Indians, in that, comparatively speaking, they have been little molested and have given little offense.

Fletcher and La Flesche, in their general avoidance of historical matter, have little to say about the great characters of Omaha history. They pay practically no attention to the remarks of early travellers—Bradbury, Long, Maximilian, and others—who found the Omahas such an interesting people and noted their customs. The renowned and oratorical Om-pa-ton-ga, Big Elk the First, comes into their story only incidentally and in one place seems to be confused with his almost equally great namesake. Two Crows, who, together with Joseph La Flesche, furnished Dorsey so much of his material, is pictured but not used as an authority; yet Two Crows was of the Honga gens and, if Fletcher and La Flesche give something concerning that gens or concerning its hereditary charge—the Sacred Pole—at variance with what he told Dorsey, we ought surely to know the source of their information and at least hear of Two Crows, especially since we are constantly hearing of Joseph La Flesche. The chief faults of their work are here hinted at—persistency of family emphasis and lack of references. Much as we should like to take what they say on faith, we are professionally obliged to refuse to do so. We also find it difficult to do their narrative justice because it is so rambling and so disorganized. The

patient reading of it, however, is adequately rewarded in all other respects. It is interesting in the extreme.

The Leading Facts of New Mexican History. By RALPH EMERSON TWITCHELL. Volume I. (Cedar Rapids, Iowa: The Torch Press. 1911. Pp. xxi, 506.)

WITH its elaborate foot-notes, bibliographies, and facsimiles of manuscripts, this beautifully printed and bound book conveys at first sight the impression that it is the result of much original investigation, and as such it has been represented by uncritical reviewers. But closer examination shows that it is nothing of the sort. The book is, as a matter of fact, purely a compilation, and of the simpler kind, most of the text being either a close paraphrase or a direct copy of two works. If the borrowing had been duly acknowledged, the book would have been welcomed and judged on its merits as a compilation; but it is unfortunately the case that the compiler, while making much show of citation and quotation of supplementary matter in the foot-notes, has, either in ignorance or flagrant disregard of literary ethics, in the main concealed the sources from which he copied or paraphrased the text, and much of the foot-note matter as well, thus creating an impression of independent work which he did not perform. Nor is he relieved of this charge in any important measure by his prefatory remark that "a great deal of the work . . . may best be termed editing", or by an occasional observance of the proprieties, which only serves to further mislead.

Such a statement as this cannot be made without at least an indication of the evidence on which it rests, and to this end most of my space will be devoted. Chapters II., III., and IV. of the book in question deal with the early Spanish exploration of New Mexico. On reading the foot-notes and bibliographies one misses references to Lowery's very pertinent work, *The Spanish Settlements within the Present Limits of the United States, 1513-1561*. A more careful reading, however, shows that Mr. Twitchell has by no means overlooked it. Indeed, the greater portion of the text of the one hundred ninety-nine pages comprised in these chapters is taken almost bodily from book II., chapters III., v., and vi. of that book, but absolutely without credit, for neither the name of Lowery nor of his book receives mention in the work. The order of presentation is identical, with few exceptions. through paragraph after paragraph, page after page, while there are hundreds, if not thousands, of identical phrases, sentences, and even large portions of paragraphs, without a single acknowledgment. Chapter III., for example, on Fray Marcos de Niza, is a paraphrase of Lowery's chapter v. By actual count one hundred fifty-nine identical phrases or sentences were found in identical connections, although the chapter contains only about ten full pages of text; nor does this state-